DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 899 SP 019 838

AUTHOR	Morris, Monica B.
TITLE	The Public School as Workplace: The Principal as a Key Element in Teacher Satisfaction. A Study of Schooling in the United States. Technical Report Series, No. 32.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. Graduate School of Education
SPONS AGENCY	Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Dayton, Ohio.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	90p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; Administrator Attitudes; Classroom Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Job Satisfaction; *Principals; School Administration; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Alienation; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Morale; Teacher Salaries; *Teaching Conditions

ABSTRACT

Data collected on school environments for "A Study of Schooling" were analyzed to determine teachers' perceptions of their work environment. Two sets of elementary, middle, and high schools were identified from teacher responses. There were 14 schools in the set having less satisfying work environments, and ten schools were in the set having more satisfying work environments. In addition to teachers' attitudes, principals' attitudes and roles, and socioeconomic factors from these two sets were investigated. Confirming results from previous studies, schools perceived by teachers as being a less satisfactory workplace tended to be larger, expend less per pupil, have higher student teacher ratios, and serve racially mixed populations. While those factors affected teacher job satisfaction, strong principal leadership emerged as a consistent factor in teacher satisfaction and motivation. Teachers' comments on their relationships with principals showed significant differences between the less satisfying and the more satisfying work environments. Strong principals were characterized as autonomous, supportive, consistent, and in control. The implications for teacher job satisfaction were evident in findings on productivity, turnover, and teacher health. Salary level was evidently not a factor in satisfaction, since, despite similar salary levels, staff turnover was significantly higher at the less satisfying schools. These findings have implications for school policymakers at the local level, who must consider the effects of decisions about school administrators on teacher performance. Comments are drawn from responses to questions to illustrate certain trends in teachers' attitudes. Appendices present information on: (1) criteria for selection of more satisfying or less satisfying schools; (2) school descriptive data; (3) principal interviews about work environment; and (4) teacher interviews about work environment. (FG)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John I Goodlad

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL AS WORKPLACE: THE PRINCIPAL AS A KEY ELEMENT IN TEACHER SATISFACTION

Monica B. Morris

Technical Report No. 32

1981

A Study of Schooling is based upon the assumption that improving schools requires knowing what is happening in and around them. A comprehensive data-base of contextual information was obtained from students, teachers, administrators, parents and observers at all grade levels in thirty-eight elementary and secondary purposively sampled schools. *It is strongly recommended that readers of any technical report in this series first read Technical Report No. 1 which outlines the details, scope and limitations of the Study as a whole.*

It must be understood that this series of technical reports does not constitute the Study. Some reports are highly specific "molecular" inquiries while others take a more "molar" view across data sources, schooling levels, etc. Some reports are more methodological in nature arising out of issues in data analysis. Many of the reports quite naturally overlap in data analysed and interpretations rendered. Some authors have approached their task as consisting mostly of data description with little discussion beyond the presentation of the data. Others have ventured further into the realm of interpretation and speculation. *It must be further understood that data-based inferences can and do differ among researchers who come at the data from differing points-of-view.* Authors, therefore, are duly acknowledged for each report and are responsible for the material presented therein.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL AS WORKPLACE: THE PRINCIPAL AS A KEY ELEMENT IN TEACHER SATISFACTION

Introduction

What makes a school a satisfying workplace for teachers? And why is work satisfaction important? Sociological and social-psychological studies of work settings suggest that the structure and organization of the workplace affect the satisfaction and effectiveness of the worker in many ways. Stressful conditions may adversely affect workers' health, either physically or psychologically, and staff turnover, one indicator of dissatisfaction, has high costs for employers (Argyris, 1964; Bentzen et al., 1980; Braude, 1975; French, 1958; Kanter, 1977; Merton, 1967; Rosow, 1974; Tausky, 1970; Job Demands and Worker Health, 1975; Work in America, 1972; and many others).

This study indicates that teachers are more satisfied with their places of work when their schools are administered by principals who have a firm sense of professional autonomy and who also regard their staff members as competent, independent professionals. While strong leadership appears to be of major importance to teachers' work satisfaction, other factors, including school size, expenditure per pupil, and the ratio of teachers to pupils are also important indicators of teacher satisfaction.

Teachers are essential to the effectiveness of schooling. An understanding of some of the factors that make schools satisfying for teachers may point to changes in the structure and organization of the school as workplace.

"A Study of Schooling"

The primary purpose of "A Study of Schooling" was to provide a detailed picture of what happens in schools, as seen through the eyes of students, parents of students, teachers, principals and other administrators, non-teaching staff, and members of the community. The aim was not to test but to generate hypotheses. No cause-effect relationships were presupposed. Questionnaires from each data source, interviews with teachers, principals, and others, and classroom observations provided data for analysis (Goodlad et al., 1979).

I approached "A Study of Schooling" after all the data had been collected, most had been coded, and several volumes of technical reports had been prepared. My first task was to examine all the prepared materials. I then turned to data not yet analyzed by others. The same considerations underlying "A Study of Schooling" guided my inquiry. I began with no preconceived ideas about what I would find. Rather, it was hoped that hypotheses about relationships would emerge and be substantiated by the wealth of descriptive materials (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

"More satisfying" and "less satisfying" schools

My first reading of all the prepared materials revealed a set of schools at each level of schooling that appeared either more or less satisfying than the remaining schools in the sample for teachers, students, and parents. My next task was to discern more systematically the criteria indicating which schools were perceived more positively or more negatively. Some 120 questions concerning perceptions of school or work climate, drug and alcohol abuse, autonomy, facilities for

learning and teaching, teaching standards, personal satisfaction with career, parent participation, and more, provided the basis for the choices (Appendix A details the sets of criteria determining the choices for teachers).

The next stage of the inquiry, then, began with two sets of schools, at three levels of schooling, perceived as "more satisfying" or "less satisfying" than the other schools in the sample for teachers, students, and parents. Considerable, although not perfect, overlap exists among the perceptions of schools for each group of respondents (see Appendix B); for the purposes of this study, only those schools selected for teachers were analyzed further. These comprised ten schools perceived as "more satisfying" and fourteen schools perceived as "less satisfying" (see Appendix C for descriptions and fictitious names of the two sets of schools).

Data not used in the initial selection of the two sets of schools were tapped in attempting to understand the factors associated with greater or lesser satisfaction with schools for teachers. These included school principals' perceptions of their own control over their work, principals' views of their teachers, and teachers' perceptions of their principals. Other untapped materials included socio-economic and geographical characteristics, per capita student expenditure, teachers' pay and other working conditions, and the congruence between teachers' beliefs about the functions of schools and the functions they perceived their schools as emphasizing.

The principal as a key element in teacher satisfaction

In comparing schools perceived as either "more satisfying" or "less

satisfying" for teachers, patterns emerged suggesting that "more satisfying" schools are more likely to be administered by principals with a strong sense of professional autonomy and authority than are "less satisfying" schools. Principals of "more satisfying" schools felt themselves to be significantly more in control of their jobs, as having more control over their use of time, and as having more influence over decisions made about their schools than did principals of "less satisfying" schools. Without exception, the principals of the "more satisfying" schools saw the amount of influence they had as congruent with the amount of influence they thought principals should have. Only sixty-four percent of principals of "less satisfying" schools saw the influence they had as congruent with the influence they thought principals should have. Tables 1, 2 and 3 demonstrate the perceived differences in control by principals of "more satisfying" and "less satisfying" schools.

Principals' attitudes towards teachers as professionals

Questions probing principals' attitudes towards teachers as professionals also revealed significant differences between the two sets of schools. Asked to choose from a list of possible "problems at this school", all the principals at the "less satisfying" schools saw "poor teaching or teachers" as a "problem at this school". Most marked it as a minor problem but some saw it as a major problem. "Poor teaching or teachers" was perceived as a problem by only half of the principals of the "more satisfying schools, and in no case was this seen as a major problem. Item A on Table 4 demonstrates this difference.

TABLE 1

Principals' Perceptions of Amount of Influence They Have and Should Have in Making Decisions for Their Schools

"More Satisfying" Schools			"Less Satisfying" Schools		
	Have	Should Have		Have	Should Have
HIGH					
Dennison	Some	Some	Bradford	Some	Some
Euclid	A lot	A lot	Manchester	A lot	Some
Woodlake	A lot	A lot	Rosemont	A lot	A lot
			Laurel	A lot	A lot
			Fairfield	Some	A lot
			Newport	A lot	A lot
MIDDLE					
Atwater	A lot	A lot	Fairfield	Some	A lot
Vista	A lot	A lot	Laurel	A lot	A lot
Euclid	A lot	A lot	Newport	A lot	A lot
			Bradford	A lot	A lot
ELEMENTARY					
Dennison	A lot	A lot	Fairfield	Some	A lot
Vista	A lot	A lot	Manchester	Some	Some
Palisades	A lot	A lot	Bradford	Some	A lot
Rosemont	A lot	A lot	Crestview	A lot	A lot
A lot	90%	90%		57%	79%
Congruence (Have & Should Have)	100%			64%	

TABLE 2

Principals' Perceptions of Amount and Adequacy of Control Over Their Own Job Performance

	"More Satisfying" Schools			"Less Satisfying" Schools		
		Amt. of Control	Adeq. of Control*		Amt. of Control	Adeq. of Control
HIGH						
	Dennison	A lot	2	Bradford	A lot	1
	Euclid	Some	1	Manchester	A lot	2
	Woodlake	Complete	2	Rosemont	A lot	2
				Laurel	A lot	2
				Fairfield	Little	1
				Newport	A lot	2
MIDDLE						
	Atwater	Complete	2	Fairfield	A lot	1
	Vista	Complete	2	Laurel	A lot	2
	Euclid	Some	1	Newport	A lot	1
				Bradford	Complete	2
ELEMENTARY						
	Dennison	Complete	2	Fairfield	Little	1
	Vista	Complete	3	Manchester	A lot	2
	Palisades	A lot	2	Bradford	A lot	2
	Rosemont	Complete	2	Crestview	A lot	2
	Complete Control	60%			7%	
	Little "	0%			14%	
	Less control than they would like		20%			36%

*1=Less than you like to have.
2=About the amount you like to have.
3=More than you like to have.

TABLE 3

Principals' Satisfaction With How Their Time is Spent

"More Satisfying" Schools		"Less Satisfying" Schools	
HIGH			
Dennison	Not Satisfied	Bradford	Satisfied
Euclid	Satisfied	Manchester	Not Satisfied
Woodlake	Satisfied	Rosemont	Satisfied
		Laurel	No Interview
		Fairfield	Not Satisfied
		Newport	Satisfied
MIDDLE			
Atwater	Satisfied	Fairfield	Not Satisfied
Vista	Satisfied	Laurel	Satisfied
Euclid	Not Satisfied	Newport	Not Satisfied
		Bradford	Satisfied
ELEMENTARY			
Dennison	Not Satisfied	Fairfield	Not Satisfied
Vista	No Interview	Manchester	Not Satisfied
Palisades	Satisfied	Bradford	Not Satisfied
Rosemont	Satisfied	Crestview	Not Satisfied
Satisfied	67%		38%

TABLE 4

Principals' Perceptions of Intensity of Three School-Related Problems

	"More Satisfying" Schools			"Less Satisfying" Schools			
	A*	B	C		A	B	C
HIGH							
Dennison	0**	0	1	Bradford	1	1	1
Euclid	1	0	0	Manchester	1	1	1
Woodlake	1	2	0	Rosemont	1	2	0
				Laurel	2	1	0
				Fairfield	2	1	1
				Newport	1	1	1
MIDDLE							
Atwater	1	0	0	Fairfield	1	1	1
Vista	1	1	0	Laurel	1	1	0
Euclid	0	0	0	Newport	1	1	1
				Bradford	1	1	0
ELEMENTARY							
Dennison	0	0	0	Fairfield	1	1	0
Vista	0	0	0	Manchester	1	1	1
Palisades	1	1	1	Bradford	1	1	1
Rosemont	0	0	0	Crestview	1	1	0
Minor problem	50%	20%	20%		86%	93%	57%
Major problem	0%	10%	0%		14%	7%	0%
	(50%)	(30%)	(20%)		(100%)	(100%)	(57%)

*A Poor teachers or teaching
B Lack of staff interest in good school-community relations
C Staff relations

**0 = Not a problem
1 = Minor problem
2 = Major problem

Significant differences were also found between the two sets of principals' responses to the statement, "Average students don't get enough attention at this school". Table 5 shows that all of the principals of the "more satisfying" schools disagreed with the statement, with eight of them principals disagreeing strongly; sixty-four percent of principals of "less satisfying" schools disagreed, four of the nine principals disagreeing strongly, the other five disagreeing mildly. Put differently, eighty percent of principals of "more satisfying" schools strongly disagreed with the statement; only twenty-nine percent of principals of "less satisfying" schools strongly disagreed that "average students don't get enough attention at this school".

A further example of the difference between the two sets of principals in their perceptions of teachers as professionals can be seen in Item B on Table 4. Every principal of the "less satisfying" schools saw "lack of staff interest in good community relations" as a problem compared to thirty percent of the principals of the "more satisfying" schools. The importance of good community relations was best summarized by the principal of Palisades Elementary: "Community aspects mean the survival of the school; therefore, I regard it as a necessity".

Principals' views of staff relations

Fifty-seven percent of principals at the "less satisfying" schools, compared to twenty percent at the "more satisfying" schools, saw "staff relations" as a problem at their schools. This can be seen in Item C, Table 4. To investigate the principals' perceptions of "staff

TABLE 5

Principals' Response to Question:
"Average Students Don't Get Enough Attention at This School."

	"More Satisfying" Schools		"Less Satisfying" Schools	
HIGH				
	Dennison	Strongly Disagree	Bradford	Mildly Disagree
	Euclid	Strongly Disagree	Manchester	Mildly Disagree
	Woodlake	Strongly Disagree	Rosemont	Strongly Disagree
			Laurel	Mildly Agree
			Fairfield	Mildly Agree
			Newport	Mildly Agree
MIDDLE				
	Atwater	Mildly Disagree	Fairfield	Strongly Agree
	Vista	Mildly Disagree	Laurel	Strongly Disagree
	Euclid	Strongly Disagree	Newport	Strongly Disagree
			Bradford	Mildly Disagree
ELEMENTARY				
	Dennison	Strongly Disagree	Fairfield	Mildly Disagree
	Vista	Strongly Disagree	Manchester	Mildly Disagree
	Palisades	Strongly Disagree	Bradford	Strongly Disagree
	Rosemont	Strongly Disagree	Crestview	Mildly Agree

Strongly Agree	0%		7%	
Mildly Agree	0%		29%	
(Agree)		(0%)		(36%)
Mildly Disagree	20%		36%	
Strongly Disagree	80%		29%	
(Disagree)		(100%)		(64%)

relations" more closely and to discern, perhaps, the ways in which principals might guide "staff relations", I compared the answers principals gave to two interview questions:

a) What are the major problems faced by new people who join this school staff?

b) How does the staff handle these problems? New staff? Rest of staff members?

Complete answers are given in Appendix D. Four principals of "more satisfying" schools and six principals of "less satisfying" schools mentioned personal involvement in helping new teachers. This might indicate little difference between principals of the more and less satisfying schools but closer examination of the responses reveals many more negative statements about their schools by principals of "less satisfying" schools than of "more satisfying" schools.

Only one principal of a "more satisfying" school (Vista Middle) indicated that there might be a problem of acceptance of a new teacher. The principal followed this with "If chairperson not capable (of overcoming the problem) principal finds out and steps in". Of principals of "less satisfying" schools, six (Manchester Elementary, Crestview Elementary, Bradford Middle, Manchester High, Fairfield High, Newport High) suggest substantial difficulties in orientation and acceptance of new staff. Of these six, only the principal of Fairfield High says that he "introduces them and gives them a start". The following responses by principals of "less satisfying" schools to the above questions about problems faced by new staff are nowhere matched in the the responses of principals in "more satisfying" schools:

Fairfield Elementary

a) "Lack of inservice - orientations - school information..."

Manchester Elementary

a) "...Personality and social undertones in the building. Challenge to individual to make it here in the building."

Bradford Elementary

a) "In the last two years we have changed our staff due to attrition and lay-offs. We have little say with teachers here - all contractual. They aren't quite accepted right away."

Manchester High

a) "Knowing others and being known. Many don't know others and make no attempt to know them. Socializing with other departments is practically unknown..."

Fairfield High

a) "They first question it and then they find they can't fight it (the problems they face) so they acquiesce - total submission. Another way - start off questioning it and then get angry and decide to go somewhere else..."

Newport High

a) "...Cliques. Long-time teachers. Turnover of staff. Many new faces here. Some departments: 8-10 annually. New teachers. School is department oriented. Makes for isolation. Lack of space. Shortages of materials and supplies creates teacher problems. Antiquated working areas. Many teachers never assimilated..."

Differences in teachers' views of principals

Just as the principals of the "more satisfying" and "less satisfying" schools differed in their perceptions of teachers as professionals, teachers' views of their principals also differed significantly at each of the two sets of schools. Table 6 shows school-related problems as perceived by teachers. Mean scores for teachers at each of the 38 schools in the sample were categorized as being of high, middle, or low intensity. At none of the "more satisfying" schools did teachers perceive "the administration" to be a problem of high intensity as compared to teachers at sixty-four percent of the "less satisfying" schools. "Staff relations"

TABLE 6

Teachers' Perceptions of the Intensity of Two School Related Problems: The Administration and Staff Relations

	"More Satisfying" Schools			"Less Satisfying" Schools		
		Admin.	Staff Rel.		Admin.	Staff Rel.
HIGH						
	Dennison	Low*	Low	Bradford	High	Mid
	Euclid	Mid	Mid	Manchester	High	Mid
	Woodlake	Mid	Mid	Rosemont	High	High
				Laurel	Mid	Low
				Fairfield	High	Mid
				Newport	High	High
MIDDLE						
	Atwater	Low	Low	Fairfield	High	Mid
	Vista	Low	Low	Laurel	High	Low
	Euclid	Mid	Low	Newport	High	Low
				Bradford	Low	Low
ELEMENTARY						
	Dennison	Low	Low	Fairfield	Low	Mid
	Vista	Mid	Mid	Manchester	High	High
	Palisades	Low	Low	Bradford	Low	Mid
	Rosemont	Low	Low	Crestview	Low	High
	LOW	60%	70%		29%	29%
	MID	40%	30%		7%	43%
	HIGH	0%	0%		64%	29%

*Classification of intensity based on teacher mean scores (1=Not a problem, 2=Minor problem, 3=Major problem) (Mean = < 1.50 = Low, 1.50-1.75 = Mid, > 1.75 = High)

were not considered a serious problem by teachers at any of the "more satisfying" schools, but were perceived as a problem of high intensity by teachers at twenty-nine percent of the "less satisfying" schools.

To probe these perceptions more deeply, teachers were asked:

a) What is the most important change that has occurred at this school in the last three years (or since you have been here, if newer teacher)? (Examples of changes: program/curriculum/personnel; students population; school/district/state/federal policies; community/parent involvement; finance and facilities, resources, and/or materials).

b) How was the change brought about? (What individuals and/or groups were involved? Who initiated? Voluntary or mandated? What type of dialogue took place? Who was involved in discussions? Who made decisions?

c) How smoothly did the change occur (Emphasis on communication process throughout all phases).

Comments drawn from answers to these questions illuminate teachers' views of principals. Extensive examples are provided in Appendix E but some sharply contrasting specimens are presented here. Again, overlap is rare in the kinds of answers given by teachers at the two sets of schools.

"MORE SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Rosemont Elementary:

"Change in principal. Principal of this school is very strong. Strong discipline now. Encouraged team-teaching and cooperative help. Supports teachers to the fullest."

"...she runs a tight ship and it shows in the quality of this school...."

"The principal is responsible for this improvement in the school."

"...(principal) has set up an ideal working environment in this school."

"...the teachers adore her and she has really made this an excellent school to work in."

"The school has improved greatly because of (principal's) strong discipline code."

Vista Elementary:

"Principal is very supportive of teachers and goes to bat for teachers."

Atwater Junior High:

"Change of administration. Failing now permitted and more stringent requirements for graduation. Kids show more desire to learn."

"New principal...a change in atmosphere - more cooperation, less rigid rules."

"...old principal authoritarian. New principal gives excellent back-up...feeling of security as a teacher in any problem that could arise."

"I feel my feelings and thoughts are considered at any time."

"Principal open to suggestions from faculty."

Vista Junior High:

"...principal...supreme organizer. He gets the best out of people."

"LESS SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Fairfield Elementary:

"Principal...his hands are tied. (Principal) isn't the strongest principal I've ever seen."

Manchester Elementary:

"Principal is a real jerk - very difficult to get along with. Do much better if he were on extended leave."

Crestview Elementary:

"Change of principal...new - not best."

"Staff now in limbo...to decide progressive vs. traditional ways."

Fairfield Junior High:

"I've been here only six weeks. If anything, things get worse day by day."

"...principal, vice principal have come and gone so many times that the school organization suffers greatly."

"If principal voices his opinion or tries to make too many changes...he is immediately fired."

"The last principal was fired because he was too much of a leader."

"...we liked the previous principal and were backing him in his ideas...but we can't get too involved for fear we will get fired and if the Board got wind of us doing this, we would be fired in an instant."

"...they fire people who voice their complaints or try to make too many changes..."

Newport Junior High:

"Principal...disciplinary methods inconsistent...kids do not respect principal...punishments are not appropriate."

"Principal's priorities are totally stupid...."

"...principal totally fragmented. Does nothing well."

"Teachers are afraid to consult (principal). He plays favorites...."

"He likes to be called Doctor (name of principal). You'd better remember it."

Manchester High:

"Rules made one day are broken the next because of pressure through parents or students."

"When he was assistant principal he ran things well, but now he isn't the man he was. Confusion in hall and attendance policy...."

"Administration policy not enforced. Getting worse."

Rosemont High:

"...principal is less friendly. He really is very autocratic. These time tests he has started are a big farce. I don't bother doing them."

"...many teachers discontented because they had no say in (longer school day)...teachers were never asked. They were just told 'This is the way it will be'."

"Quite often the directives we get from administration are unclear and they very seldom follow through...."

"He doesn't listen to the teachers and is not open to suggestions."

Newport High:

"Incompetent leadership and administration."

"...we just don't know him (the principal). He is not visible."

"...he deals with notes. You write a note, you receive one back. No communication by principal with students. No student knows principal. Low morale."

A further set of questions asked teachers:

a) What are the major problems faced by new people who join the staff? (What was it like when you were a new teacher here? Is it the same or different now? In what ways do teachers make new staff members feel welcome or isolated? Probe for socialization processes in this and the following question.)

b) How does the staff handle these problems? New staff members? Rest of staff?

Responses again showed teachers' perceptions of attempts made by principals to draw new teachers into the school and to help in developing a sense of community within the school. For more complete examples see Appendix F. A sample of contrasting answers is presented below:

"MORE SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Rosemont Elementary:

"...the principal gives you a huge manual to read...."

"...the principal took me around and introduced me to all the teachers and the counselors helped me with getting acquainted with location of all the materials.... It was really an ideal situation to come into."

"...we are all very close, which I attribute to the principal."

"The principal was the key factor in making my adjustment easy...."

Vista Junior High:

"Department heads and principal all helpful."

Woodlake High:

"...administration provides strong guidelines for new staff and students."

"LESS SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Fairfield Elementary:

"...there is no orientation for new teachers.... Most are scared to death. There is no social gathering for teachers before school starts, and then there is no time to help them.... The administration we never see, and when we do they don't even know us or even that we work here."

"Inadequate orientation...."

"No help from anyone at first."

Manchester Elementary:

"Depends how aggressive they are - if not, they flounder on their own."

"Nothing is done."

"They don't know the principal's personality and take him at face value. He lies."

"Keep a low profile. Roll with the punches."

"Either ignore the administration or else stand up to them and hold your ground."

Crestview Elementary:

"Finding out who you can trust or not, when to talk or not...."

"New staff left on own."

Fairfield Junior High:

"Can't get any help around here. No one will help me get acquainted with other teachers or the routine. The maintenance is horrible around here. They haven't cleaned my room in a month."

"...the principal and the vice principal are too busy to help anybody."

"I've been working here for five years and I wouldn't give my job to my worst enemy...."

"New teachers are not briefed or prepared for the job."

Newport Junior High:

"Faculty is not a community. Support...difficult to find. School is divided into 'we' and 'they' (administration is 'they')...."

"No hospitality set up...."

"In-group and paternal attitude of principal is very threatening to the majority of teachers here...."

Bradford High School:

"Absolutely no administrative help. Bad place to start...."

Manchester High:

"...not enough leadership from administration...."

"They just learn to survive...."

Rosemont High:

"...teachers are just underlings. We're treated like errant children. There's no help given to new teachers at all...."

Fairfield High:

"...we just keep our mouths shut."

Other factors associated with teacher satisfaction

While strong principal leadership seems to play an important part in teachers' work satisfaction, other factors also indicate teachers' satisfaction with their schools: school size; expenditure per pupil; ratio of students to teachers; and the congruence between the functions teachers believe their schools should emphasize and the functions they perceive their schools as actually emphasizing.

School size. Table 7 shows considerable differences in the sizes of the "more satisfying" and "less satisfying" schools. These differences are especially marked at the high school level. The average number of students is 508 at the "more satisfying" high schools and 1713 at the "less satisfying" high schools. One of the "less satisfying" high schools, Laurel, is very small, with only 271 students. The remaining five "less satisfying" high schools range from 1137 to 3006 students.

Expenditure per pupil. The amount of money spent on each pupil also varies substantially between the two sets of schools. Table 8 shows average expenditure at "more satisfying" schools approximately thirty-three percent higher than at "less satisfying" schools. The difference is substantially greater at middle level schools where expenditure per child at "more satisfying" schools is almost double that at "less satisfying" middle schools.

Ratio of students to teachers. The ratio of students to teachers also varies noticeably between "more" and "less" satisfying schools.

TABLE 7

School Size

	"More Satisfying" Schools	Number of Students	"Less Satisfying" Schools	Number of Students
HIGH				
	Dennison	61	Bradford	1350
	Euclid	262	Manchester	3006
	Woodlake	1202	Rosemont	2702
			Laurel	271
			Fairfield	1137
			Newport	2508
	AVERAGE	508		1713
	(without Dennison)	(732)		
MIDDLE				
	Atwater	496	Fairfield	764
	Vista	1188	Laurel	276
	Euclid	133	Newport	1649
			Bradford	858
	AVERAGE	605		879
	(without Euclid)	(842)		
ELEMENTARY				
	Dennison	48	Fairfield	906
	Vista	745	Manchester	598
	Palisades	340	Bradford	613
	Rosemont	521	Crestview	605
	AVERAGE	413		680
	(without Dennison)	(535)		

TABLE 8

Expenditure per Child

	"More Satisfying" Schools	Dollars per Year	"Less Satisfying" Schools	Dollars per Year
HIGH				
	Dennison	Not available	Bradford	Not available
	Euclid	1947.47	Manchester	900.04
	Woodlake	830.80	Rosemont	1151.70
			Laurel	342.85
			Fairfield	799.04
			Newport	1296.41
	AVERAGE	$1389.13		$827.82
MIDDLE				
	Atwater	1590.34	Fairfield	799.20
	Vista	897.09	Laurel	276.94
	Euclid	1576.66	Newport	1102.45
			Bradford	Not available
	AVERAGE	$1354.70		$726.20
ELEMENTARY				
	Dennison	Not available	Fairfield	799.20
	Vista	897.09	Manchester	755.81
	Palisades	1043.96	Bradford	Not available
	Rosemont	1151.70	Crestview	882.47
	AVERAGE	$1030.92		$812.49
	OVERALL AVERAGE	$1241.90		$827.82

Table 9 shows substantial differences, especially at the high school level. At "less satisfying" high schools the ratio is about twenty-two students to each teacher compared to about thirteen students for each teacher at "more satisfying" high schools. At the elementary level, the ratio is about twenty-four students to one teacher at "less satisfying" schools compared to about eighteen students per teacher at "more satisfying" schools. Similar differences are noted when the comparison is based on average class size of sampled classes.

Functions congruence. One interest of "A Study of Schooling" was to discover the relative importance to teachers, principals, parents, and students, of the four major goals of schools. The four goals, or "functions", are intellectual development, social development, personal development, and vocational development (see Overman, 1980, and Klein et al., 1979). Table 10 shows the functions congruence for teachers. Teachers at "more satisfying" schools are significantly more likely to agree that the goals their schools emphasize are the goals that should be emphasized than are the teachers at the "less satisfying" schools. At twelve of the fourteen "less satisfying" schools, or eighty-five percent, congruence is below the median for their levels. At only three of the "more satisfying" schools, or thirty percent, is congruence below the median for their levels.

Workplace satisfaction not associated with teachers' pay

The satisfaction teachers feel about their work does not seem to be associated with the pay they receive. Both the lowest and the highest median teacher salaries were found at the "less satisfying" schools while some relatively low salaries were paid to teachers at schools perceived as "more satisfying". Table 11 shows median and maximum salaries at the

TABLE 9

Ratio of Students to Teachers

	"More Satisfying" Schools			"Less Satisfying" Schools	
	1*	2**		1	2
HIGH					
Dennison	5.5	10.8	Bradford	21.4	23.8
Euclid	10.9	16.5	Manchester	26.3	29.2
Woodlake	21.0	26.8	Rosemont	22.3	24.3
			Laurel	15.0	22.9
			Fairfield	19.9	24.8
			Newport	29.5	26.2
AVERAGE	12.5	18.0		22.4	25.2
MIDDLE					
Atwater	20.6	22.1	Fairfield	17.8	25.0
Vista	24.0	27.0	Laurel	11.5	25.3
Euclid	10.2	23.1	Newport	22.0	31.6
			Bradford	24.5	29.2
AVERAGE	18.3	24.1		19.0	27.8
ELEMENTARY					
Dennison	12.0	12.7	Fairfield	20.0	30.2
Vista	24.8	27.4	Manchester	28.5	33.2
Palisades	18.9	28.9	Bradford	29.2	31.1
Rosemont	17.4	27.2	Crestview	20.1	25.0
AVERAGE	18.3	24.0		24.4	30.0

*Number of students divided by number of teachers at each school.

**Average class size of sampled classes.

TABLE 10

Percentage of Teachers Who Selected the Same Function in Response to the Functions Perceived and Functions Emphasis Questions*

	"More Satisfying" Schools		"Less Satisfying" Schools	
		% Congruence		% Congruence
HIGH				
	Dennison	60.0	Bradford	15.6
	Euclid	36.4	Manchester	40.0
	Woodlake	44.2	Rosemont	23.6
			Laurel	41.2
			Fairfield	21.4
			Newport	32.0
	AVERAGE	46.9		28.8
MIDDLE				
	Atwater	56.5	Fairfield	31.4
	Vista	58.3	Laurel	38.1
	Euclid	33.3	Newport	36.2
			Bradford	40.7
	AVERAGE	49.4		36.6
ELEMENTARY				
	Dennison	25.0	Fairfield	50.0
	Vista	51.7	Manchester	38.5
	Palisades	82.4	Bradford	47.4
	Rosemont	58.6	Crestview	41.4
	AVERAGE	54.4		44.3
	OVERALL AVERAGE	50.6%		34.5%
	Max.	82.4		50.0
	Min.	25.0		15.6

*Which function do you think receives the most emphasis at this school (perceived)? Which function do you think should be emphasized at this school (preferred)? Response choices: Social, Intellectual, Personal, Vocational.

TABLE 11

Teachers' Salaries
Median and Maximum

	"More Satisfying" Schools			"Less Satisfying" Schools	
	Median	Maximum		Median	Maximum
HIGH					
Dennison	Not Available		Bradford	$13,776	$20,433#
Euclid	$11,841	$15,165	Manchester	21,277	22,102*
Woodlake	13,586	19,880	Rosemont	11,000	14,000
			Laurel	9,590	12,786
			Fairfield	10,700	12,780
			Newport	Not Available	
AVERAGE	$12,714	$17,522		$13,269	$16,420
MIDDLE					
Atwater	15,632	20,238	Fairfield	10,700	12,780
Vista	12,380	17,219	Laurel	9,590	11,188
Euclid	11,092	13,630	Newport	Not Available	
			Bradford	13,776	20,433#
AVERAGE	$13,035	$17,029		$11,355	$14,800
ELEMENTARY					
Dennison	Not Available		Fairfield	10,700	12,780
Vista	11,949	14,192	Manchester	18,592	21,977*
Palisades	14,772	23,772	Bradford	13,776	20,433#
Rosemont	11,000	14,000	Crestview	13,119	16,232
AVERAGE	$12,574	$17,321		$14,047	$17,856

* denotes AFL/CIO

# denotes AFT

two sets of schools. "Less satisfying" schools do have markedly lower salaries at the middle level. Salaries for Newport schools were not available; these might have raised the average for "less satisfying" middle schools.

Discussion

Elements associated with teacher satisfaction

Few would find surprising that the "less satisfying" schools for teachers tend to be larger, to expend less per pupil, and to have higher student/teacher ratios than do "more satisfying" schools. The difficulties of working in very large schools, with inadequate materials, are voiced by many teachers and some principals in this study:

> "...the maintenance is horrible;...inadequate supply materials;...classes so enormous;...we don't have enough workable materials;...repairs are never made;... ...we have so many teachers;...the largeness of staff, size of building, overwhelming;...too many students; ...we have 3000 students; size of building, size of faculty, make interaction difficult, leave some staff feeling isolated and compartmentalized;...larger faculty has made us less close;...many teachers never assimilated;...faculty so large;...faculty so so big...."

And, few would find surprising that, of the fourteen "less satisfying" schools, ten, or seventy-one percent, serve primarily black students, Mexican and Mexican-American students, or are racially mixed, while, of the ten "more satisfying" schools, only two, or twenty percent, serve non-white students. All of these findings confirm most existing reports about the public schools, raising the same questions of educational opportunity that have been discussed for decades (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Carnoy, 1974; Jencks et al., 1972; Oakes, 1981; and many others).

The principal as a key element in teacher satisfaction

The findings of this study regarding the importance of principals to teachers' satisfaction with their schools are supported by a number of studies (Atkins, 1977; Becker, 1977; Squires, 1980; and others). According to Becker's observations of the authority system of the public schools (1977), the principal is accepted by teachers as the supreme authority in the school. The office contains the authority, no matter how poorly the principal fills the position but, Becker suggests, teachers' acceptance of the principal's superiority has limits. Principals are expected to be in control, to act "impressively tough" on occasion, always to back the teacher up, and not infringe upon the teacher's authority with students and parents, no matter what the circumstances.

What is, perhaps, surprising about the findings of this present study of the association between a strong principal and teacher satisfaction is the extent to which Becker's findings, drawn from very limited observations, are confirmed, illustrated, and extended by study of this much more broadly drawn sample of schools. "A Study of Schooling" closely examined thirty-eight schools--rural, urban, and suburban--at three levels, in seven states. The twenty-four schools selected as "more satisfying" and "less satisfying" for teachers draws from all seven of the states: the "more satisfying" schools draw from five states, the "less satisfying" schools draw from five states, with three states providing both "more satisfying" and "less satisfying" schools.

Expectation that principals will always back teacher up

Repeatedly, teachers at "more satisfying" schools commented that their principal:

"Supports teachers to the fullest."

"Is very supportive of the staff."

"Is very supportive of teachers."

"'Goes to bat' for teachers."

"Gives excellent back-up."

At "less satisfying" schools only one teacher spoke of his principal as "very supportive of me" but, from his commentary, it could be seen that he was one of the principal's "favorites" at a school (Newport Junior High) where many teachers referred disparagingly to the "favoritism" of the principal. Where teachers at "less satisfying" schools referred to the support they received from their principals, they were usually referring to a principal who had left the school.

Principals are expected to be in control

Below are some comments from teachers at "more satisfying" schools about the control of their principals:

"New principal...kids more accountable."

"Principal initiated program."

"Administration provides strong guidelines."

"Principal of this school very strong.
Strong discipline now."

"More effective discipline in this school
since (principal) came."

"New principal has strong discipline rules."

"The school needed this change (to a stronger principal) because school had gotten very lax in discipline areas."

"Mandated by principal that...a very positive change."

"Principal pushed them through (teachers and students in a new program)."

Compare the above statements about principal control with those by teachers from "less satisfying" schools.

"Of course, a principal can do only so much...."

"Head doesn't know what the body is doing."

"You can't count on the administration."

"Principal...since he came...nothing implemented."

"If principal voices his opinion or tries to make too many changes he is immediately fired."

"School board runs the show."

"Kids do not respect principal."

"Administration...totally impotent."

"Principal...does nothing well."

"Administration policies not enforced."

"Administration afraid to defend anyone."

"Incompetent leadership."

"Control" of the school by the principal does not appear to mean autocratic control. Teachers at "more satisfying" schools repeatedly commented that the principal works and cooperates with teachers and regards teachers as valuable colleagues:

"Previous principal more structured - this one allows more exchange of ideas from teachers."

"Teachers are considered when changes are made...consider teachers' qualifications in any change."

"My feelings and thoughts are considered."

"Principal open to suggestions from faculty."

"Teachers and administration work together in being more demanding in academic areas."

"Principal asks for teacher input. We work together on all problems."

"Decisions are made after thorough discussion."

"We all have a say in decision."

"Easier to work with new principal... communication more open."

"Administration receptive to changes."

Contrast the above statements about principal/teacher cooperation with those from teachers at "less satisfying" schools:

"The administration we never see, and when we do they don't even know us or even that we work here."

"...arbitrary decision process by administration."

"Principal just has final say on everything.... Our vote...ignored."

"Principal is a benevolent despot. All assignments arbitrary. Teachers not involved in decision process. We are treated in a way that is professionally insulting."

"Administration is paternal."

"...paternal attitude of principal."

"Teachers were never asked (about change), they were just told...."

"He makes every decision. Doesn't want any suggestions...he doesn't listen to the teachers and is not open to suggestions."

"Teachers are just underlings. We are treated like errant children."

"Teachers and students don't know what is expected."

"The principal...he makes all the decisions."

"We just don't know him. He is not visible."

"No communication between teachers and principal."

At the "less satisfying" schools many teachers expressed their frustration at working without clear guidelines, and the difficulties of maintaining discipline when rules are not enforced. No such comments were made by teachers at "more satisfying" schools:

"Not enough guidance from the administration. No guidance in curriculum problems."

"Lack of information from the administration."

"Disciplinary methods inconsistent...punishments not appropriate."

"Various arbitrary switches made over past two years."

"Staff now in limbo - left to selves to decide progressive bs. traditional ways."

"A lot of double standards...one student is able to be excused when another isn't. Rules are not maintained."

"No follow through of rules."

"Rules made one day are broken the next."

"Confusion in policy...when I ask a student to make up work he will go to the principal and have it waived."

"Principal does not back up stand when he takes one."

"Administration policies not enforced."

"Not much initiated is ever followed through."

"We have rules over rules that are never enforced."

"Quite often the directives we get from the administration are unclear and they very seldom follow through."

"No follow-through on scheduling or clearing the calendar."

A good principal, then, from the viewpoint of the teachers in this study, is himself or herself autonomous, treats his or her staff members as colleagues and as professionals, and is consistent in his dealings with teachers and students. Indeed, it seems intuitively reasonable to expect that teachers will experience greater work satisfaction and that their morale will be higher when they are viewed by their supervisor as the professionals they perceive themselves to be.

The importance of teacher satisfaction

Productivity. It might also seem reasonable to expect that satisfied workers will be more effective, more productive, than dissatisfied workers. "A Study of Schooling" did not examine student achievement so few comparisons can be made in this study about the relative effectiveness of teachers at the "more satisfying" and "less satisfying" schools. Some studies of work settings other than schools indicate that worker satisfaction may, in fact, lead to lower rather than higher productivity. A finding reported by Tannenbaum and his

associates in the Human Relations Research Group at UCLA indicated that restrictive leadership, although less favorably viewed by subordinates than permissive leadership, yielded somewhat more productivity than permissive leadership (cited in Tausky, p. 171). Further, Likert reports that "although high pressure reduces morale, output goes up beyond the level occurring at the high morale stage" (Tausky, 1970, p. 170). Other studies, though, show that both morale and efficiency increased when workers were involved by management in discussions about the way work was to be done, and when they participated in discussions of the production process (Braude, 1975, p. 185).

Turnover. Less ambiguous than findings relating work satisfaction and productivity are those on staff turnover, a measure consistently related to lack of satisfaction. Staff turnover represents significant direct costs to the employer (Rosow, 1974, p. 125; Tausky, 1970, p. 184).

Table 12 shows teacher turnover rates for the two sets of schools. Turnover at the "less satisfying" schools is particularly high at both the middle level and at some of the high schools, with turnover at some schools around one in three teachers and at one school (Fairfield Junior High) a remarkable fifty-seven percent. One can only conjecture the discontinuity of education caused by such high rates of turnover.

It is notable that, with the exception of Bradford Junior High, turnover is particularly high at the "less satisfying" schools with low salaries (Fairfield Junior High, Laurel Junior High, Laurel High, Fairfield High) (see Table 11 for salaries). Manchester Elementary, a "less satisfying" school, has no teacher turnover but has relatively high salaries; the school is represented by AFL/CIO. This indicates

TABLE 12

Teacher Turnover and Absenteeism

	"More Satisfying" Schools		"Less Satisfying" Schools		
		Turnover	Absenteeism	Turnover	Absenteeism
HIGH					
	Dennison	Not Available	Bradford	4.0%	5.2%
	Euclid	9.0%	1.7%	Manchester	11.0	8.0
	Woodlake	Not Available	Rosemont	12.0	6.5
			Laurel	40.0	6.6
			Fairfield	30.0	3.8
			Newport	Not Available	
				19.4%	6.0%
MIDDLE					
	Atwater	4.0	3.0	Fairfield	57.0	N.A.
	Vista	13.0	11.0	Laurel	38.0	5.5
	Euclid	0.0	1.0	Newport	Not Available	
				Bradford	34.0	8.0
	AVERAGE	5.7%	5.0%		43.0%	6.8%
ELEMENTARY					
	Dennison	Not Available	Fairfield	13.0	5.0
	Vista	13.0	3.0	Manchester	0.0	2.5
	Palisades	10.0	4.0	Bradford	N.A.	1.0
	Rosemont	13.0	1.0	Crestview	10.0	6.0
	AVERAGE	12.0%	2.7%		7.7%	3.6%

that relatively high salaries are not, in themselves, sufficient to make for teacher satisfaction but that they may be a factor that persuades teachers to stay in their otherwise less than satisfying schools.

Teacher health and work satisfaction

An important reason for examining work satisfaction for teachers is the well-documented relationship between stressful work conditions and both physical and psychological health (Braude, 1975; Rosow, 1974; Tausky, 1970; Job Demands and Worker Health, 1975; Work in America, 1972). The findings of a recent study of health problems of teachers are particularly pertinent to this discussion. Needle, Griffin, and Svendsen (1981) surveyed a five percent random sample of Minnesota public school teachers (N = 2,096) about working conditions, teaching problems, chronic health conditions, and general physical health. The findings suggest that teachers' overall perceived that stress centers around relationships with others, particularly with the principal, safety in the classroom, and administrative and resource support.

Forty-five percent reported at least one chronic health condition. Teachers who find principals competent and more supportive also report greater well-being and fewer symptoms of ill health (emphasis added).

Further implications of strong principal leadership

The major concern of this study is with teachers' work satisfaction, teachers' well-being, and teachers' health. The findings indicate that teacher satisfaction appears to be associated with strong principal leadership in the school.

The literature suggests that strong principal leadership is also associated with school effectiveness. Thomas Sowell presents a case

for the importance of a strong principal to the excellence of the programs a school provides for its students. In reviewing the history of several successful black schools which produced large numbers of notable students, Sowell (1976) places major credit for the excellence of the schools upon principals. Despite lack of money and equipment, poor facilities, lack of support from all-white boards of education, and many other obstacles, the schools flourished under strong principals--some black, some white--and declined with less powerful principals. Sowell cites a recent study of unusually successful ghetto schools by the Office of Educational Personnel Review in New York which concludes that "the quality and attitude of the administrator seemed to be the only real difference" between these schools and less successful ones". According to Sowell, dedicated teachers at the successful schools in his sample set high standards for students, inspiring them to develop a sense of individual worth and pride of achievement.

Sowell's study has bearing on this study of the public school as workplace in that considerable overlap exists among the schools perceived as "more" or "less" satisfying for teachers and those so perceived for students and for parents in the sample (see Appendix B).

Summary of Findings

This study of the public school as workplace examines the differences and the similarities between schools perceived as "more satisfying" and "less satisfying" for teachers. Some clear differences emerge: "more satisfying" schools tend to be smaller than "less satisfying" schools, to enroll fewer students per teachers, and to

expend more per student per year. Teachers at "more satisfying" schools are significantly more likely than those at "less satisfying" schools to feel that the functions emphasized at their schools are congruent with the functions their schools should emphasize. They are less likely to perceive "the administration" and "staff relations" as a problem at their schools than are teachers at "less satisfying" schools.

Teacher turnover is significantly higher at "less satisfying" schools than at "more satisfying" schools. Salary scales at the two sets of schools are not markedly different; teacher satisfaction does not appear to be related to salary, but staff turnover is generally higher at "less satisfying" schools where salaries are low, relative to other "less satisfying" schools.

Good principal leadership appears to be strongly associated with teacher satisfaction. Teachers at "more satisfying" schools are significantly more likely to perceive their principals favorably than are those at "less satisfying" schools. They generally see their principals as supportive of staff, as respecting teachers as professionals and as considering their opinions and suggestions, as showing consistency in establishing the following rules of discipline, and as creating a favorable working climate.

At "less satisfying" schools, teachers are more likely to perceive their principals as incompetent, with little power, as "playing favorites" with the staff, and as inconsistent in meting out rewards and punishments than are teachers at "more satisfying" schools.

Teachers' views of principals are closely matched by principals' perceptions about staff and about their own roles. At "more satisfying"

schools, principals are more likely to perceive their teachers as competent professionals than are principals at "less satisfying" schools. Principals at "more satisfying" schools are significantly more likely to feel themselves in control of their jobs and as secure in their ability to make decisions for their schools than are principals of "less satisfying" schools.

The importance of work satisfaction for teachers and for schools

In the earlier discussion, teachers' work satisfaction was seen as important for reasons of health, well-being, and morale. Work, as a core activity, is central to concept of self. For these reasons, alone, it is important to study the factors making for work satisfaction.

Benefits and costs for schools of teachers' satisfaction and dissatisfaction are also measurable. Staff turnover, substantially higher in "less satisfying" schools, is costly for school districts. Recruitment is time and energy consuming, as is the orientation and training of new staff in any organization. Despite a reasonable supply of teachers, new teachers are not attracted to schools with reputations as unsatisfying, difficult, or dangerous places of work. Staff retention in such schools is a serious problem.

The evidence of a relationship between teacher satisfaction and student achievement was not examined in this study but work on successful schools (Rutter, 1979; Sowell, 1976) concludes that differences in student attainment were not due to physical factors of the school, such as school size and age of buildings, but, rather, to factors open to modification by the staff. These include academic emphasis, availability of incentives and rewards, and social processes within the

school. According to Rutter, a school develops an "ethos". Staff members help generate the ethos in their expectations of students' work and behavior, in the models they provide in their own conduct, and in the feedback students receive from them about what is acceptable and what is not acceptable at school.

Academic outcomes tended to be better when both the curriculum and approaches to discipline were agreed upon and supported by the staff acting together. Examination successes were more frequent and delinquency less common in schools where discipline was based on general expectations set by the school and having wide support. A school-wide set of norms and behaviors was apparent in more successful schools and where staff worked harmoniously towards agreed goals. In schools with good student attainment, teachers stated that their views were represented and considered: "It seemed necessary that teachers should feel that they had some part in the decision-making process..." (Rutter, 1979, p. 193).

Teacher satisfaction was not the subject of Rutter's study but some similarities can be seen between the more successful schools for student attainment in Rutter's study and the "more satisfying" schools for teachers in this study. In "more satisfying" schools teachers were far more likely to perceive themselves as having a part in the decision-making process than were teachers in the "less satisfying" schools. Discipline of students was fair and consistent in "more satisfying" schools, arbitrary in "less satisfying" schools. A significantly higher congruence was expressed by teachers in "more satisfying" than "less satisfying" schools between their perceptions of the functions

emphasized in their schools and the functions they thought should be emphasized.

While no claim can be made here that student achievement and teacher satisfaction are associated, the evidence linking Rutter's study of successful schools with this study is provocative. Further, it is intuitively reasonable to expect that students will be happier in school, hence attend more regularly and learn more, when their teachers' self-concept and morale are high, and when their teachers believe that their school emphasizes the functions it should emphasize. It is also reasonable to expect substantial discontinuity in the learning of any subject matter with very high teacher turnover. Finally, teachers who express sentiments about their schools such as those voiced by teachers at "more satisfying" schools in this study, could be expected to behave before students in ways reflecting their positive feelings. This has significance if, as Rutter suggests, teachers' conduct serves as a model for students.

Conclusions

The principal as a key element in teachers' work satisfaction: some policy implications

This study, among others, makes clear that the school principal is a key element in teachers' work satisfaction. Also indicated is that teachers' work satisfaction is important for a number of reasons. Superintendents of schools, school boards, and agencies concerned with education need to understand the factors making for satisfying schools if necessary changes are to be implemented.

From the foregoing, it should not be concluded that all schools can be transformed into excellent workplaces by the replacement of

existing principals with new, "strong" principals. Or that these excellent workplaces would soon produce high-achieving students and that all the problems of the public schools would be solved. For, there are many other elements to be considered in teachers' satisfaction with their schools.

First, while the association between work satisfaction and a "strong" principal does exist, this study does not make clear that the presence of such a principal causes work satisfaction. It is possible that in a school where other factors are favorable, even a "weak" principal may not lessen teachers' satisfaction with their work. This could be the case in a very small school with few students per teacher, a homogeneous population, and where a single set of norms is shared by all. An example might be the "more satisfying" Dennison High, a small rural school. The principal of Dennison High saw himself as having only "some" influence in making decisions for his schools, whereas ninety percent of the principals of "more satisfying" schools saw themselves as having "a lot" of influence. He answered "no" when asked if he spent his time at work in the way he wanted to spend his time, indicating somewhat limited autonomy.

On the other hand, the principal of Bradford Junior High, a suburban school, perceived himself as having "complete" control in how he carried out his job and as having autonomy over his use of time. Staff at Bradford Junior High did not see "the administration" as a problem at their school. Yet, the school was perceived as "less satisfying" for teachers and despite relatively high pay, teacher turnover was thirty-four percent.

Second, principals with a strong sense of autonomy, who regard their staff members as independent professionals, and who "go to bat" for their teachers, may not last long enough in some school districts to change a "less satisfying" school to a "more satisfying" one for teachers. This was the case in the Fairfield schools where, at the time this study was conducted, the school board denied autonomy to its principals and removed them from office--if they did not leave of their own accord first--when they attempted to bring about any change, however slight. This was particularly noticeable at the high school level.

By contrast, one urban school district, Rosemont, deliberately recruited for its elementary school a strong "trouble-shooter" with a track record of improving schools. In three years, the principal was as successful in restoring discipline and winning her teachers' loyalty as she had been in a similar, earlier, assignment. In this case, the principal was given the charge of changing the school and was allowed complete autonomy by the school board.

It is evident that a principal will experience great difficulty in creating a satisfying work environment for his or her staff without the full support of school district administrators. Yet even such support may not be sufficient for success. Rules and regulations are passed down to schools not only from local districts but also from state offices of education and from the federal government. Dozens of programs for numerous special groups, and for which schools are held accountable, are mandated from both the state and federal levels. The task of the school principal may be further helped or hampered by

teachers' groups and other bargaining organizations.

The evidence remains, though, that "more satisfying" schools for teachers are more likely than "less satisfying" schools to be headed by principals whose relationship with teachers is collegial rather than autocratic. Needing further study and, perhaps, experiment, is a clarification of the tasks of a strong principal. While principals should bear responsibility for encouraging teachers' professional growth, should they also be evaluators and teachers of teachers? If so, can the important collegiality and trust between principal and staff be maintained?

Before radical, across the board, replacements of school principals are considered, I would recommend experimental studies, designed specifically to isolate those areas of work satisfaction and student achievement than can be enhanced by the actions of the school principal, and to categorize different styles of leadership and conditions under which each style is effective. Also requiring examination are the political factors helping or hindering the ability of the principal to improve the climate of the school. This involves inquiry into the structure of community power as it affects the schools.

The study and experiment recommended above would build on the findings of "A Study of Schooling", on other existing literature on successful schools and successful school principals, and on further study of schools known to be both satisfying for teachers and effective for students.

REFERENCES

Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Atkins, Victor and Neil Kauffman. Three Suburban Principals Talk About Change. National Elementary Principal, 1977, 56, 4 (March/April).

Becker, Howard S. The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School. Chapter 10 in Sociological Work. New Brunswick, New Jersey: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1977.

Bentzen, Mary M. Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1974.

Bentzen, Mary M., Richard C. Williams and Paul Heckman. A Study of Schooling: Adult Experiences in Schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 61, 394-397.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Braude, Lee. Work and Workers. New York: Praeger, 1975.

Carnoy, Martin. Education as Cultural Imperialism. New York: David McKay, 1974.

Drake, Daniel D. and Ernest M. Schuttenberg. Toward Educational Excellence in an Urban Junior High School. NASSP Bulletin, 1976, 60, 401.

French, J.R.P., et al. Employee Participation in a Program of Industrial Change. Personnel, 1958, 35, 16-29.

Ganz, Harold J. and Wayne K. Hoy. Patterns of Succession of Elementary Principals and Organizational Change. Planning and Changing, 1977, 8, 2-3, 185-190 (Summer/Fall).

Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm Strauss. The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Goodlad, John I., Kenneth S. Sirotnik and Bette C. Overman. A Study of Schooling: An overview. Phi Delta Kappan, 1979, 61, 174-178.

Howes, Kimball L. Pathways and Pitfalls in Introducing Change. NASSP Bulletin, 1976, 60, 399, 43-51 (April).

Jackson, J.A. (Ed.) Professions and Professionalization. Cambridge England: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Jencks, Christopher, et al. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Johnson, Bruce and Charles A. Sloan. A Study of Elementary School Principals' Self Perceptions of Change Agent Behavior. Procedures for Adopting Educational Innovations. Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Texas University, 1977.

Kanter, Rosabeth, Moss. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Klein, Frances M., Kenneth A. Tye and Joyce E. Wright. A Study of Schooling: Curriculum. Phi Delta Kappan, 1979, 61, 244-248.

Krajewski, Robert J. and Paul E. Zintgraff. Identifying Innovational Constraints: A Model for School Principals. Educational Technology, 1977, 17, 12, 26-9 (December).

Licata, Joseph W. In the School's Social System is the Principal an Effective Change Agent? NASSP Bulletin, 1975, 59, 395, 75-81 (December).

Licata, Joseph W., Elmer C. Ellis and Charles M. Wilson. Initiating Structure for Educational Change. NASSP Bulletin, 1977, 61, 408, 25-33 (April).

Merton, Robert K. Bureaucratic Structure and Personality in Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Miskel, Cecil G. Principals' Perceived Effectiveness, Innovation Effort, and the School Situation. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 1977, 13, 1, 31-46 (Winter).

Needle, Richard H., Tom Griffin and Roger Svendsen. Occupational Stress: Coping and Health Problems of Teachers. The Journal of School Health, 1981, 51, 3, 175-181 (March).

Overman, Bette C. Functions of Schooling: Perceptions and Preferences of Parents, Teachers and Students. A Study of Schooling, Technical Report No. 10. Laboratory in School and Community Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1980.

Oakes, Jeannie. Limiting Opportunity: Student Race and Curricular Differences in Secondary Vocational Education. A Study of Schooling, Technical Report No. 28. Laboratory in School and Community Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1981.

Pedersen, Eigil, Therese Annette Faucher and William W. Eaton. A New Perspective on the Effects of First-Grade Teachers on Children's Subsequent Adult Status. Harvard Educational Review, 1978, 48, 1, 1-31.

Rosow, Jerome M. (Ed.) The Worker and the Job. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1974.

Rutter, Michael, Barbara Maughan, Peter Mortimor and Janet Ouston. Fifteen Thousand Hours. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Sowell, Thomas. Patterns of Black Excellence. The Public Interest, 1976, 26-58 (Spring).

Tausky, Kurt. Work Organizations. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1970.

Terkel, Studs. Working. New York: Avon Books, 1975.

Every Child Can Learn. A Report on the Symposium for Effective Schools. Maryland: National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1980.

Job Demands and Worker Health. Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1975.

Work in America. Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of H.E.W. Cambridge, Mass., and London, England: The MIT Press, 1972.

APPENDIX A

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF "MORE SATISFYING" AND "LESS SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF "MORE SATISFYING" AND "LESS SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Teachers

The criteria by which schools emerged as more or less satisfying to teachers were grouped under seven headings;

1. Climate of work or work environment.
2. Facilities and resources available for all students to learn and to be advised.
3. Facilities and resources available for teachers' work and comfort.
4. Teachers' personal satisfaction with career or career choices.
5. Teachers' perceived problems with students.
6. Teachers' perceptions of parents and parents' role in the school.
7. Letter grade by which teachers graded their school.

1. Climate of work or work environment included responses to questions on measures of perceived job control, relations with staff, and concern with personal safety.

B22*	How much control do you have overall in how you carry out your own job? (Weighting 1)**
D49-D57	How much control do you feel you have over decisions about each of the following areas of your planning and teaching? (Selected out were those who answered "little". Weighting ¼ on each item.)
PSDM	Quality of problem solving/decision-making (1).
S_WRKFAC	Staff/work facilitations (1).
S_TASK	Staff/task orientation (1).
SS_AFFCT	Staff to staff affection (1).
S_RENEWL	Staff self renewal (1).
S_OPEN	Staff openness (1).
B116	Personal friends among teachers (1).
B118	Personal friends among non-teaching staff (1).

*Data file reference code.

**Weighting is either negative or positive, depending upon the question. Each school develops a negative and a positive score.

B119 Personal friends among parents (1).

B99 Satisfaction with current teacher evaluation (1).

N12 "Student violence is a problem at this school" (1).

N49 "I fear for my own safety at this school" (1).

2. Facilities and resources available for all students to learn and to be advised

N23 Teachers' satisfaction with counseling for students (1).

N48 Library resources adequate (1).

N14 Students of all races get an equally good education at this school (1).

N27 At this school students are usually placed in the classes that are best for them (1).

N28 Students at this school receive a lot of individual attention from their teachers (1).

N43 Students are graded too easy at this school (1).

N45 This school is doing a good job of teaching students about the political and economic systems of other countries (1).

APPROP1-3 For approximately what percentage of students in this class are the materials and content appropriate according to each of the following criteria: ability, ethnicity and background, interests of the students? (¼ point given on positive side for each score of "100% or almost all, ¼ point on negative side for each score of "about 50%". The one score of "about 25%" was given ¼ point on the negative side.) (Fairfield Junior High, Social Studies interest.)

N44 Not enough money is spent for education at this school (1).

N1 Most of the teachers at this school are doing a good job (1).

N23 Too many students are allowed to graduate from this school without learning very much (1).

N5 Many teachers at this school are prejudiced (1).

N10 Many teachers at this school don't care about students (1).

3. Facilities and resources available for teachers' work and comfort

B120 Satisfaction with school facilities for work (1).

B121 Satisfaction with school facilities for relaxation (1).

B14 How much help do you feel you have in carrying out your job? (1 positive point for high score on "adequate", 1 negative point for high score on "not enough".)

A172-174 Resources perceived as available: district personnel; immediate education agency/County office; State and Federal agencies (½ point for each, negative or positive).

A175-177 Resource people consulted (½ point each, negative or positive).

4. Teachers' personal satisfaction with career or career choices

A57-A80 Teachers feeling adequately or not adequately prepared in a a subject they are currently teaching. Elementary schools only (1 positive point when 80% or more teachers felt adequately prepared in all subjects. ½ point on negative side for high percentages of "not adequately prepared" responses. For example, 10/21 teachers at Vista Elementary felt not adequately prepared to teach arts.)

A32 Looking back on your expectations before you started your present career, were those expectations fulfilled? (1).

A33 If you had to do it again, would you choose education as a career? (1).

5. Teachers' perceived problems with students

N8 Drug use is a problem at this school (1 point positive or negative for low or high score).

N20 Many students at this school don't care about learning (1).

N22 Alcohol among students is a problem at this school (1).

6. Teachers' perceptions of parents and parents' role in the school

P20-43 Teachers do not think parents have enough influence in the school (1 for negative).

P153 Teachers' reports of parents' response to teacher contacts (1 positive point for high score on "parent responds quickly"; 1 negative point for high score on "parent does not respond".)

Teacher answering "yes" to "enough" parent participation--(1 positive point for high levels of response, 1 negative point for under 20% "enough" responses).

N37 The only time most parents visit schools is when their children are in trouble (1).

P140 Reason for parent non-involvement given as "teacher/principal attitudes". 1 negative point for more than 30% responses of this kind. Rationale--indicates something about school or principal intimidates parents or puts parents off.

7. Letter grade by which teachers graded their school

D11 A to Fail.

Note: Other sets of criteria are used to categorize schools as "more favorable" or "less favorable" for parents and for students. These are available but are not presented here.

APPENDIX B

"MORE SATISFYING" AND "LESS SATISFYING" SCHOOLS
SHOWING OVERLAP FOR TEACHERS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS

TABLE 13

"MORE SATISFYING" AND "LESS SATISFYING" SCHOOLS
SHOWING OVERLAP FOR TEACHERS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS

"More Satisfying" Schools	T	P	S	"Less Satisfying" Schools	T	P	S
HIGH							
Dennison	X	X	X	Bradford	X	X	X
Euclid	X	X	X	Manchester	X	X	X
Woodlake	X	-	X	Rosemont	X	-	-
				Laurel	X	-	-
				Fairfield	X	X	X
				Newport	X	X	*
MIDDLE							
Atwater	X	*	*	Fairfield	X	X	X
Vista	X	X	*	Laurel	X	X	X
Euclid	X	X	X	Newport	X	X	-
				Bradford	X	X	X
ELEMENTARY							
Dennison	X	X	X	Fairfield	X	X	X
Vista	X	X	*	Manchester	X	X	X
Palisades	X	X	X	Bradford	X	X	X
Rosemont	X	-	-	Crestview	X	-	*

*Indicates very close to choice for either "more satisfying" or "less satisfying" school. For example, Vista Elementary School was 4th choice for "more satisfying" schools for students; however, only three elementary schools were chosen by the researcher in this category.

APPENDIX C

SCHOOL DESCRIPTIVE DATA

59

SCHOOL DESCRIPTIVE DATA

"MORE SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

	Grade Span	Population Size		SES	Location	Race/Ethnicity (%)				
		Teachers	Students			Wh.	Bl.	Or.	Mx.	Other
High										
Dennison	7 - 12	11	61	Mid	Rural	97	1	0	2	0
Euclid	9 - 12	24	262	Mid	Rural	100	0	0	0	0
Woodlake	10 - 12	57	1202	Mid	Suburban	80	5	10	3	2
Middle										
Atwater	7 - 9	24	496	Mid	Suburban	94	1	2	1	2
Vista	7 - 8	49	1188	Mid	Suburban	98	1	1	1	0
Euclid	7 - 8	13	133	Mid	Rural	99	0	0	0	0
Elementary										
Dennison	K - 6	4	48	Mid	Rural	97	1	0	2	0
Vista	K - 6	30	745	Mid	Suburban	98	1	1	0	0
Palisades	K - 5	18	340	Hi/Mid	Urban	53	46	1	0	0
Rosemont	K - 5	30	521	Lo	Urban	0	0	0	100	0

SCHOOL DESCRIPTIVE DATA

Page 2

"LESS SATISFYING" SCHOOLS	Grade Span	Population Size		SES	Location	Race/Ethnicity (%)				
		Teachers	Students			Wh.	Bl.	Or.	Mx.	Other
High										
Bradford	10 - 12	63	1350	Mid/Lo	Suburban	90	8	0	0	2
Manchester	9 - 12	114	3006	Mid	Urban	0	99	0	0	0
Rosemont	9 - 12	121	2702	Lo	Urban	0	0	0	100	0
Laurel	9 - 12	18	271	Lo	Rural	52	48	0	0	0
Fairfield	9 - 12	57	1137	Mid/Lo	Rural	53	4	1	42	0
Newport	10 - 12	85	2508	Mid	Urban	47	9	17	18	9
Middle										
Fairfield	7 - 8	42	764	Mid/Lo	Rural	46	4	0	50	0
Laurel	6 - 8	24	276	Lo	Rural	51	49	0	0	0
Newport	7 - 9	75	1649	Mid	Urban	46	11	17	25	1
Bradford	7 - 9	35	858	Mid/Lo	Suburban	95	5	0	0	0
Elementary										
Fairfield	K - 6	45	906	Mid/Lo	Rural	34	0	0	66	0
Manchester	K - 5	21	598	Mid	Urban	0	99	0	0	0
Bradford	K - 6	21	613	Mid/Lo	Suburban	99	0	0	0	1
Crestview	K - 5	30	605	Mid/Lo	Suburban	99	1	0	0	0

APPENDIX D

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEWS - WORK ENVIRONMENT

a. What are the major problems faced by new people who join this school staff?

b. How does the staff handle these problems? New staff? Rest of staff members?

"MORE SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Dennison Elementary. No interview

Vista Elementary. No interview

Palisades Elementary

a) No problem faced by new people. Formal communication in teams. Informal communication is good. Teachers are friendly and enjoy the association of their peers.

b) Informal atmosphere breaks down the newness. They eat lunch together. Rest of staff makes little gestures of friendship. We are small and informal. We call each other by first names. No problems.

Rosemont Elementary

a) Understanding policy of school and adjusting to running of school. Teachers from other schools take more time in correcting past habits. New teachers have easier time molding to this new environment but more difficulty adjusting to routine of teaching.

b) Principal talks to new teachers numerous times in beginning. Develops personal relationships. Lets new teachers "feel free" to consult with her or ask for advice. All teachers very willing to help each other. Team teaching gives new teachers reliable source to turn to for help.

Atwater Middle

a) No problems with new staff. Very little turnover. Selection process rather complicated with parents, teachers, and community steering committee. I make final choice after rating sheet completed on scale 1 - 4. Any high rated applicant is given an interview. Very close scrutiny. Superintendent plays a leadership role.

b) Staff helpful to newcomers.

Vista Middle

a) Depends on department new person joins. Strong, good department chairman acts as liaison. Could be clique in department that wouldn't accept teacher. Large school could be overwhelming.

b) If chairperson not capable, principal finds out and steps in. Tries to hire teachers who fit in.

Euclid Middle

a) No problems in general. New teachers sometimes surprised at extra duties such as selling tickets but are told of these extra assignments before hiring.

b) No problems. Teachers and administration tend to get along.

Dennison High

a) Teacher has a lot more preparation with modular courses, more planning. No special problems for new people.

b) Administration holds a barbecue and his Christmas party for entire staff. Administrator (principal) and wife enjoy socializing with staff outside of school.

Euclid High

a) School, like any, has students who will test a teacher's limitations. Single people joining staff have limited social life--small rural town.

b) They socialize with fellow staff members who introduce them to the community, thus they acquire their own circle of friends.

Woodlake High

a) Ones who transfer within district, no problem. New teachers find no particular social life here (Name) is a family town. Families don't have much problem but single teachers complain of isolation in the community.

"LESS SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Fairfield Elementary

a) Lack of inservice--orientations--school information. New teachers are thrown in together with everyone right away in the beginning of the school year and this just isn't enough. We are working on this problem and hope to get something started for our new teachers....

b) Principal assigns teachers next door to the new teachers for guidance and advice. This seems to help some because I introduce them and give them a start. I tell the older teacher to help the new teacher in any way she can. It still isn't enough but it's a start. I hope to have a new program for new teachers soon.

Manchester Elementary

a) Orientation to community and staff expectations. Unique population here. Personality and social undertones in the building. Challenge to individual to make it here in building.

b) Encourage them to find a confidante to express themselves and help them.

Bradford Elementary

a) In last two years we have changed our staff due to attrition and lay-offs. We have little say with teachers here--all contractual. They aren't quite accepted right away.

b) Meet with principal at beginning of year. Learn about school policy, community, parents. Meet all special people in building--learning consultant as well as teachers.

Crestview Elementary

a) Blending into team. Working within team.

b) Communicating. Getting along. Learning to facilitate with team. Human relations problems.

Fairfield Middle

a) Getting to know and understand this community. Most of the teachers come from the inner city so they aren't used to the low economic status of the parents. They have some difficulty communicating with the parents because of either a language barrier or lack of transportation for getting to the school.

b) I try to help especially the new teachers with this type of problem.

Laurel Middle

a) We do not have a major problem. We have a pre-planning for 3 - 4 days. Black and white work together. I made this sure right from the beginning. That we have to work together. We have a turnover in teachers. Many teachers come from (nearby town) whose spouses work at the university there. I like to get local people--they stay longer.

b) New members ask me and other teachers for help. The staff is very cooperative. We have no problems here.

Newport Middle. No reply

Bradford Middle

a) Since we have no pre-period during the day (problem) getting to know other staff members. Also don't have department heads so (problem) learning what should be taught in their area. Clique of old timers may not be quite as friendly.

b) Take his opportunity to do same on his own.

Bradford High

a) Learning names of facilitating people in school. How to get background on students, etc. Older staff quite friendly.

b) Department chairman first contact, then assistant principal. Then we have faculty meetings for voicing problems. Also building representative for union.

Manchester High

a) Knowing others and being known. Many don't know others and make no attempt to know them. Socializing with other departments is practically unknown. Usually are introduced to those in own department.

b) I suspect they tell department head or administrator if they need extra discipline. Counselors or security handle it. We have 3000 students here.

Rosemont High

a) Teacher has to be parent and counselor here too because of the type of our students. Sees no staff problems in new teachers coming to (this school).

b) Has small faculty meetings--to talk to staff in small groups--better understanding and to get to know each other better.

Laurel High. No interview

Fairfield High

a) Adjusting to the methods and atmosphere of the entire district. I don't think there is any difference from district to district regarding new teacher coming in and getting along.

b) They first question it and then they find they can't fight it so they acquiesce--total submission. Another way--start off questioning it and then they get angry and decide to go somewhere else. Another way--they can operate here as anywhere else, so they will try to band together and get some things corrected.

Newport High

a) Getting acquainted. Teacher works independently. Cliques. Longtime teachers. Turnover of staff. Many new faces here. Some departments: 8 - 10 annually. New teachers. School is department-oriented. Makes for isolation. Lack of space. Shortages of materials and supplies creates teacher problems. Antiquated working areas. Many teachers never assimilated.

b) Group process. Help each other. Rest up to department staff to help new one. No overt assistance. Some try to help. There is need for more team work.

APPENDIX E

TEACHER INTERVIEWS - WORK ENVIRONMENT

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ABOUT CHANGE AND PRINCIPAL

TEACHER INTERVIEWS - WORK ENVIRONMENT
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ABOUT CHANGE AND PRINCIPAL

Teachers were asked:

a. What is the most important change that has occurred at this school in the last three years (or since you have been here, if newer teacher)? (Examples of changes: program/curriculum; personnel; student population, school/district/state/federal policies; community/parent involvement; finances and facilities, resources, and/or materials).

b. How was the change brought about? (What individual and/or groups were involved? Who initiated? Voluntary or mandated? What type of dialogue took place? Who was involved in the discussions? Who made decisions?)

c. How smoothly did the change occur? (Emphasis on Communication Process throughout all phases.)

Responses to the above questions referring to principals were isolated:

"MORE SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Rosemont Elementary

a) Change in principal. Principal of this school is very strong. Strong discipline now. Encouraged team teaching--and cooperative help. Supports teachers to the fullest.

More effective discipline in this school. Since (name of principal) came to (Rosemont) there has been strict discipline and the school has greatly improved. She runs a "tight ship" and it shows in the quality of this school. Before she came there was complete uncontrol as far as discipline in the school.

New principal who has strong discipline rules.

b) The principal is responsible for the improvement in the school.

The old principal was a real weakling and not a good disciplinarian at all. (Name of principal) is very good as far as discipline is concerned. She is very supportive of the staff and is really a little authoritarian.

c) I think that (name of principal) has set up an ideal working environment in this school.

I don't know what this school was like before but I know it is a great school to work in, especially with (name of principal).

She is in her second year here and she has had to work hard to establish such a complete command of the school.

The old principal wasn't very good. There was no discipline and he wasn't very supportive of his faculty. Now (name of principal) has really done a great job as principal. She straightened up the school campus and established very strict discipline. The teachers adore her and she has really made this a good school to work in.

The school has improved greatly because of (name of principal's) strong discipline code.

Palisades Elementary

b) The principal initiated the involvement (change in student body, parent involvement). She worked hard to get the community involved and got interesting programs going. We lost students and had to do something to remain open. The principal did good PR work for us in the community.'

Vista Elementary

b) Principal is very supportive of teachers and goes to bat for teachers (in updating curriculum).

Change initiated (more teachers hired) due to teacher pressure. The principal was aware of the problem and he went through the central office to petition for additional teachers.

Atwater Junior High

a) New principal prefers to have the students be more self responsible. The previous principal was more structured and this one allows more exchange of ideas from teachers.

New principal. Curriculum stable and good.

Change of administration. Failing now permitted and more strict requirement for graduation. Kids show more desire to learn.

Change in principal--positive change from a very strict principal to one who puts more responsibility on students.

New principal--no change in studies, etc., but a change in atmosphere--more cooperation, less rigid rules.

New principal. Positive. More kids want to learn again.

Change in principal--less fear--a more warm, demonstrative type--gives more personal choice--a more open climate.

New principal has been a positive thing. Old principal authoritarian. New principal gives excellent backup. Kids more accountable. Feeling of security as a teacher in any problem that could arise.

Change of administration--positive. General climate of building changed. Attitude of student body changed--more self-discipline. Workshops for kids and staff (separate and together) in self-esteem. Very well accepted.

b) Teachers are considered when changes are made. I feel they consider teachers' qualifications in any change.

I feel my feelings and thoughts are considered at any time.

Principal open to suggestions from faculty.

Teachers and administration work together in being more demanding in academic areas.

Mandated by principal that each teacher makes out goals for each class and give copy to him. This throws responsibility for education on teachers and students as well as "schools". Teachers have a right of input--teachers discuss it among themselves and then with the principal. This has been a very positive change.

Principal asks for teacher input. We work together on all problems.

Decisions are made after thorough discussion.

...new principal insists teachers handle more of their own discipline problems. We all have a say in decisions.

Vista Junior High

a) New Principal...change for the better.

Changed principal. Positive.

(Name) made principal here--more positive administration now. (This change made respondent decide to stay at this school.)

Supreme organizer. He gets the best out of people.

Easier to work with new principal. Communication more open--not aloof. Talk freely.

Dennison High

a) Modular programs. Work didn't seem hard because teachers and students were excited about change and thought it would be worthwhile. (Name of principal) pushed them through with a lot of help.

Euclid High

b) Good administration and teachers facilitate good climate among students.

Administration receptive to changes....

Principal initiated program and got the teacher interested in it and made necessary contact with school board and state department.

"LESS SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Fairfield Elementary

a) Of course a principal can do only so much. His orders are passed down from the main office so his hands are tied. (Name) isn't the strongest principal I've ever seen.

Manchester Elementary

a) Principal is a real jerk--very difficult to get along with. Do much better if he were on extended leave.

Crestview Elementary

a) Change of principal. Old principal very innovative. New--not best.

Old (principal) traditional, teachers not feel supported; picky and strict disciplinarian. New--easy-going, stands behind teachers, individualized.

Staff now in limbo--left to themselves to decide progressive vs. traditional ways.

Staff wants and accepts superintendance and ideas but since (name of principal) came this fall nothing has been implemented yet.

Fairfield Junior High

a) Changes in administration. All members, i.e., principal, vice-principal have some and gone so many times that the school organization suffers greatly.

...I've been here eleven years and for a while we were having (a new principal) every year. The principal that is here now has never had any previous experience in school administration.

I've been here only six weeks. If anything, things get worse day by day.

b) The school board hires a new principal almost every 3 - 5 years. Same with vice-principal. If the principal voices his opinion or tries to make too many changes (which happened in this case) then he is immediately fired. The school board runs the show totally. No one interferes with their empire.

Last principal relieved of his job and moved to administrative office. The superintendent headed this switch because the principal was very supportive of the teachers and was really voicing his complaints and starting to get some results (especially with all the "backing" from the teachers). He was in office one minute and out the next. The present principal was hired as a "so-called" teacher for a week before he was moved into the principal position. ...I'm almost positive he was here to spy on the teachers as well as the principal.

The last principal was fired because he was too much of a leader and the superintendent didn't like it.

c) ...we liked the previous principal and we were backing him in his ideas for the changes he wanted to make. But we can't get too involved for fear that we will get fired--and if the board got wind of us doing this we would be fired in an instant.

Very rocky. This school administration is a small dictatorship. They hire only the teachers and staff who won't require a high salary. They fire people who voice their complaints too loudly or try to make too many changes. They want those people running scared and need any job they can get.

Very difficult. Many good teachers quit because of this change and the ones who didn't leave the school are left with a bitter attitude.... This was just one more of the blows we had to take from the main office. They took our only strength away from us.

Laurel Junior High

b) White teachers have a few cliques. The principal does nothing to discourage them.

Newport Junior High

a) Old female principal--rigid, traditionally rule-oriented. Changed to new male principal who is antithesis of all that...he is very supportive of me.

b) Discipline has decreased with new principal because of suspension of corporal punishment. Tenor of our society now--not all his burden. Disciplinary methods inconsistent. Truancy and tardiness on the rise because of permissive, decentralized attitude. Kids do not respect principal...aren't threatened by being sent to his office. Punishments are not appropriate. Children need a model for developing inner discipline...I feel sorry for them.

Principal's priorities are totally stupid. Wants to build a cafeteria on our only grass area.

Health has been deemphasized here. Principal just changed it. He likes to be called Doctor (name). You'd better remember it. No one else consulted. Typical arbitrary decision process by administration.

Original classes so enormous. I demanded smaller classes and said I'd teach six classes. Demand respected and later given back regular schedule. "If you produce, you get." This is the principal's philosophy. And because I produce, I do get. I've created my own empire.

Proposed by administration for trial. Then teachers voted on system after two years. 60 - 1 against the new system. Our votes often "advisory". Vote ignored...no justification for action. Principal just has final say on everything. Same on other issues, e.g., teachers don't want home-rooms, principal does, they exist.

Administration at bottom of well with everyone standing on its shoulders. Totally impotent. Administration responds with "let's discuss it", which means it's shelved.

Too much freedom here. Principal totally fragmented--does nothing well.

Breeds staff dissonance. We are treated in a way that is professionally limiting. He is a benevolent despot. All assignments arbitrary. Teachers not involved in decision process. Built-in lack of communication.

Teachers are afraid to consult (name of principal). He plays favorites among a selected group of young and inexperienced teachers.

No longer the nice guy he was when he was vice-principal. Power corrupts.... Some teachers simply disagree with his ideology on discipline. Complaining among selves. No direct confrontation of principal. We have to go by the chain of command.

Teachers selectively praised...some never praised.

Bradford High

a) Administrative conflict. Do not agree with one another. Not positive situation. Strictly punitive. Administrative bickering filtered to staff.

Nothing constructive happening.

Apathy of kids is getting worse. Nothing has changed. Everything in the school has been the same for years.

Primarily between principal and assistant. One would like to get rid of the other. On a personal level, I can get along. On a professional level, I can't. Educationally, they don't know what you are talking about. It's an uncomfortable situation. Kids are aware of it, too.

Change of administration has caused a decline in attitude of student to stay in school. Students are being discouraged rather than helped. A lot of double standards taking place. One student is able to be excused when another isn't. Rules are not maintained.

Manchester High

a) I do not think our administration gets out into the building to see what is going on....

Quality of administrators has improved dramatically.

Little control.

New principal--school has become more student-oriented.

Ineffective attempts at control--no follow-through of rules made at meetings.

Rules made one day are broken the next because of pressure through parents or students.

Administrative inability to tackle the problems.

The principal is probably a major factor in administrative strength.

When he was assistant principal he ran things well, but now he isn't the man he was. Confusion in hall and attendance policy. When I ask a student to make up work he will go to the principal and it will be waived--so I don't bother now. If a student wants to make up work, OK, or if not, I don't care. Loose hours for teachers--continual tardiness by teachers. Principal doesn't seem to get off first floor all semester.

Principal is not able to take a stand on issues. Does not back up his stand when he takes one.

Administration has brought about improvements. Like accessibility of principal.

Administration policies not enforced--getting worse.

Been here 23 years. Administration is afraid to defend anyone. Parents - Regents Board.

Change smooth. Principal backs up teachers.

Run by principal--union is involved sometimes--not much initiated is ever followed through.

Rosemont High

a) Longer school day. Change by principal so we could offer more classes to students.

Our library is not open to students. You cannot send kids there. Our principal and our librarian will not allow it. If they ever do get in, the librarian will not let some of the kids check out the books they want to. We talk about motivating them and then we don't let them try. No wonder our kids are bored in study hall.

A larger faculty has made us less close. I think the principal is less friendly. He really is very autocratic. These time tests he has started are a big farce. I don't bother doing them.

Because the day was extended, many teachers discontented because they had no say in any of this. The tactics used were not good. Teachers were never asked. They were just told "This is the way it will be."

The administration somewhat inefficient.

Quite often the directives we get from administration are unclear and they very seldom follow through....

Delegation of authority is not here and that's bad. He (the principal) makes every decision. Doesn't want any suggestions. I think his biggest problem is he doesn't listen to the teachers and is not open to suggestions.

Laurel High

Researcher's note. Teachers see new superintendent as a positive change and motivating force. No mention by any of the teachers of the principal who appears to be very weak, even nonexistent for all practical purposes.

Fairfield High

a) The old principal resigned and we just got lucky.

Getting the new principal has been a good change.

He has a more objective philosophy--treats everyone fairly. Honest.

Newport High

a) Lack of communication. Present administrator's attitude: "Tell them as little as they need to know." ...teachers and students don't know what is expected. No bulletin boards.

Change of principal. From liberal and open to conservative. Keeps status quo.

The administration is uninvolved. He could care less--don't rock the boat.

Change of principal. New one better.

Incompetent leadership and administration. Rotation every two plus years. Superficial reorganization takes place. Example (of lack of leadership): Teacher absent 14 weeks. Substitutes only looked at television with students. Principal, vice-principal, etc. never came into my class to see substitute. Nothing taught.

First principal left suddenly--under pressure. Felt he lacked leadership. Second principal--moved to a better job. Third principal here now. This one on his way up too and will probably be leaving.

New principal from (place) transferred here. We just don't know him. He is not visible.

No communication between teachers and principal. He deals with notes. You write a note, you receive one back. No communication by principal with students. No student knows principal. Low morale.

APPENDIX F

TEACHER INTERVIEWS - WORK ENVIRONMENT

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ABOUT PROBLEMS OF NEW STAFF

TEACHER INTERVIEWS - WORK ENVIRONMENT
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ABOUT PROBLEMS OF NEW STAFF

Teachers were asked the following questions:

a. What are the major problems faced by new people who join the staff? (What was it like when you were a new teacher here? It is the same or different now? In what ways do teachers make new staff members feel welcome or isolated? Probe for socialization processes on this and the following question.)

b. How does staff handle these problems? New staff members? Rest of staff.

Responses to the above questions that pointed to principals' attempts to draw teachers into the school were isolated:

"MORE SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Rosemont Elementary

...the principal gives you a huge manual to read....

Friendly atmosphere, especially in this school. The principal took me around and introduced me to all the teachers and the counselors, helped me with getting acquainted with location of all the materials, etc. It was really an ideal situation to come into.

The old principal never helped me when I first came here. This year especially has been fantastic because the school has pulled together and we are all very close, which I attribute to the principal.

The principal was the key factor in making my adjustment so easy. The other faculty was very supportive and helpful.

Individual help from the other teachers and especially from the principal.

Vista Junior High

Department heads and principal all helpful.

Chairperson capable of taking new people in--if not, principal finds out and he steps in. Tries to hire teachers that fit in.

Woodlake High

Learning ropes of administration. Administration provides strong guidelines for new staff and students. Teachers' "goodies day" which introduces new to old and vice versa.

"LESS SATISFYING" SCHOOLS

Fairfield Elementary

We are always getting new teachers here so we usually have company in being new and uninformed. New teachers are not well informed about their extra responsibilities like all the paper workwork, insurance, etc.

I've been here four years and the school has changed a good deal. There is no orientation for new teachers and some of the new, inexperienced teachers don't even know about all the paperwork and the unwritten rules in teaching at a school. Most are scared to death.... There is no social gathering for teachers to get acquainted with each other personally before school starts, and then there is no time to help them.

(Teachers) come and go so quickly that you don't have time to know them well before they leave. The administration we never see, and when we do they don't even know us or that we even work here.

Inadequate orientation. Inadequate supply materials from school.

No help from anyone at first.

Manchester Elementary

Depends how aggressive they are--if not, they flounder on their own.

You either handle it or you don't on your own.

Nothing is done.

Keep a low profile.... Roll with the punches.

Either ignore the administration or else stand up to them and hold your ground.

They don't know the principal's personality. Take him at face value.

Bradford Elementary

Political climate of central administration is sometimes detrimental to various programs and projects, improvements taking place within school. Decisions involving individuals made without their previous knowledge and just thrust upon them. People are expected to make policy decisions without having direction of which decisions they should or should not make--not given proper authority here.

In last two years we have changed over our staff due to attrition and layoffs...we have little say into teachers here...all contractual.

Crestview Elementary

Most teachers hard to get to know. No open communication. New staff left on own.

Finding out who you can trust or not, when to talk or not....

New staff left on own.

New teachers are ignored for two years. Not open atmosphere.

Teachers unfriendly to new staff. Administration not friendly. Many cliques.

Lack of communication. New not informed on school details.

Very difficult to get in. No feeling of acceptance--do own thing.

If not adjust--not stay.

Overlooked by old staff.

Fairfield Junior High

Can't get any help around here. No one will help me get acquainted with other teachers or the routine. The maintenance is horrible around here. They haven't cleaned my room in a month.

Discipline problems for new teachers. Administration change creates problems. Gotten worse lately. When I first came here it wasn't like this at all. The school was smaller then and we didn't have half the problems with the administration. Now all the teachers are running scared because jobs are harder to get now and they are trying to hold onto the ones they have. This includes being as careful as possible in keeping a "good" record with the principal and Board.

Lack of information about the school. The principal and vice-principal are too busy to help anybody.

I've been working here for five years and I wouldn't give my job to my worst enemy. New teachers aren't told anything about the school when they first get here.

Lack of information from the administration.

New teachers are not briefed or prepared for the job.

Orientation eight years ago but I don't think they have an orientation any more. It really depends on the principal you have in your school.

Lack of information about the school.

Don't prepare them for new responsibilities.

It is really sad to see the new teachers struggling to meet the other teachers and learn their way around here. It never gets better from year to year. The change in personnel each year gets larger.

I don't think the school administration helped any new teacher feel welcome or even comfortable. No one really sees or gets to know the school board members so they are powerful and feared authority figures to many new and old teachers.

Newport Junior High

Faculty is not a community. Support, emotional and practical, is therefore difficult to find. School is divided into "we" and "they" (Administration is "they").

Despite (name of principal's) compassion, new teachers get short end. New teachers cut off. Usually find niche eventually...but difficult.

We appear to be friendly, but we're really not to newcomers. No hospitality set up. Administration meets with new teachers to give them protocol. We eventually knit in a new teacher but it takes forever. I've noticed that the black clerical staff is more friendly to new black teachers than other teachers are.... New person could flounder around forever and feel very lonely.

When a new teacher comes, cliques do exist and in addition to (principal's) IN/OUT group new members must confront. Administration here is paternal. Teachers selectively praised--some never praised. If principal "chooses" new person it's OK. Lot of jealousy among teachers.

My greatest source of support when I came was (name of principal). Phenomenal--helped me on every imagineable level--totally accessible. I did the approaching. A more timid teacher might not realize how great he is, and not use him.

Just this year (principal) established "Buddy System". A department chairman assigns someone in appropriate department to be a buddy to a new teacher. Buddy supposed to accompany, support, on any level necessary. Role defined by two individuals. Very loose. As of yet, not much used....

Car pools. Special orientation meetings. Drive around (name of city) in small groups. Principal and a few new teachers. Human interaction. Principal very skilled in relations on individual human level.

New teacher has to do all the breaking in. Maybe 10 percent of the staff go out of their way to make you feel welcome. You would have to be very outgoing in order to survive socially.

In-group and paternal attitude of principal is very threatening to the majority of teachers here.

Introduction party. Faculty Association-sponsored. Assistant principal gave protocol meetings. Principal doesn't really do anything either....

Occasional parties. Not very warm.... Faculty meetings--mass gatherings. No personnel input. Purpose vague. Teachers hate them.

Principal has orientation meetings--personal tour of (city) and the school.

Bradford Junior High

Consult with administration or counselors depending on nature of problem.

Bradford High School

Principal usually asks them (new teachers) to do things older teachers don't want to do. Because they are vulnerable the first few years, they are put upon. Depends on the department chairman, on how they are treated. If you have a good one like I do, it's more tolerable. They are introduced at the first faculty meeting.

Absolutely no administrative help. Poor place to start. Been here five years and it was no different.

I was hired because I knew principal. It was easy for me. 7 years ago. I originated programs here. The staff as a whole will help, but not from administration. No help.

The administration does not properly evaluate teachers. In 17 years, no administrator has entered my room. As important as world history is, the administration impedes good students from taking world history. 15 students out of 1500 are taking world history this semester.

Manchester High

I can't compare my experience. It was a pleasure when I entered. But now we have so many teachers. It's impossible, because of time, and so many new teachers.

The largeness of staff, size of building; knowing where all facilities are, and general awesome responsibilities overwhelm new teachers initially.

Too many students in school. Not enough leadership from administration.

Lack of communication. Nobody tells them the way things are done. Not only true of new people, true of old staff, too. We have rules over rules that are never enforced. When I came here (9 years), the school was smaller, people had more time for people. They were more willing to help. I was given a handbook immediately. I haven't had one of those for years.

Not enough help from administration or teachers.

(Problem) Getting clear instructions from administration.

The size of the building, and the size of the faculty, make interaction difficult, with some staff feeling isolated and compartmentalized.

Can't say administration helps new teachers adjust.

No administration help for new teachers.

Administration no help for new teachers aside from surface introductions.

They just learn to survive.

Rosemont High

...faculty so large.

This faculty is extremely closed...unfriendly. We should be treated as professionals instead of non-professionals. Nothing is every organized. If someone does something wrong--everybody else is blamed publicly for it.... It is very difficult to get in to see and talk with administration. If and when we do discuss a problem they never do anything about it. This encourages independent discussions, plus the fact that there is only one person here who has any authority--no one else can do anything without his approval.

Faculty so big....

The administration somewhat inefficient.

We have a clique here--they're very open but small. As a general rule the majority can't teach and are the complainers. They're super at staying in (the principal's) good standing. I have no respect for them. They dominate his time--thus, no other teachers bother to see him. He's really fair to everyone.

...quite often the directives we get from administration are unclear and they very seldom follow through....

Delegation of authority is not here and that's bad. He (the principal) makes every decision. Doesn't want any suggestions. I think (the principal's) biggest problem is he doesn't listen to the teachers and is not open to suggestions. He does not use his administration as much as he could.

Overwhelmed by numbers (faculty).

Unwritten policies--calling meetings at the last minute without any consideration of teachers' schedules. There's no feeling of understanding. Teachers are just underlings. We're treated like errant children. There's no help given to new teachers at all. No follow through on scheduling events or clearing the calendar. They tell us to be more flexible. This just means "don't have plans of your own."

Because our school is so large, some have the feeling the faculty is cold. Too much feeling (the principal) doesn't care. He puts on a big show but I don't know if he's ever help to me. Enforcing rules is our problem. Our deans follow through but they can't control everything.

I don't think the administration works with new teachers--in guiding them or listening to their problems. A tendency for associations to form with their own departments. A few cliques, a few favored by the principal over others.

Fortunately we math people stick together. I probably only know a third of the faculty and don't care to know the rest. I don't go out of my way to meet new people only if they're in the math section. I don't come to the office because the secretaries are so terrible and the principal isn't very helpful to individuals. He makes all the decisions.

We mostly get frustrated (new teachers) are the last to find out things. We find out many things from the students. Teacher to teacher relationship good--teacher to administration poor.

We make suggestions but nothing is ever done.... I think administration is afraid of parents. Students aren't suspended any more.

We're familiar with the situation and know how to work around it. There is only one voice of authority here and that's our principal. Sometimes it would be nice to be able to go to someone else instead of trying to get a word with him.

I just leave them alone now when they come to me for something. I reminded one how she treated me last year, so I didn't help her.

Fairfield High School

We don't handle them. That's way we have them (problems). Morale is very low all the time.

We don't. We just keep our mouths shut.

Newport High School

New teachers--travel from classrooms. No feeling of security. Little or no assistance by administration and/or staff. New colleagues do own thing.